United Nations A/C.2/70/SR.31

General Assembly
Seventieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
15 January 2016

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 31st meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 12 November 2015, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Logar ..... (Slovenia)

Contents

Organization of work

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(d) Commodities (*continued*)

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)

Agenda item 23: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) Science and technology for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 27: Towards global partnerships (*continued*)

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

Agenda item 64: Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (*continued*)

Organization of work

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

15-19864 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Organization of work

1. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that a survey had been distributed to Committee members pursuant to the request of the Committee for Programme and Coordination, which had recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to include in future programme performance reports comprehensive information on the impact of the reduction in the number of printed documents on the intergovernmental decision-making process in United Nations conferences and meetings. The survey was to be returned to the Committee for Programme and Coordination with specific and quantifiable data collected from delegations at the current meeting.

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(d) Commodities (*continued*) (A/C.2/70/L.25)

Draft resolution on commodities (A/C.2/70/L.25)

2. **Mr. Marobe** (South Africa), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.25 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group was deeply concerned by the fact that many commodity-dependent developing countries continued to be highly vulnerable to price fluctuations and still battled with the after-effects of the 2007-2008 global financial crises. Developing countries remained vulnerable to external shocks and thus needed international support to overcome such obstacles. Excessive commodity price volatility must be addressed, in particular by assisting producers, especially small-scale producers, to manage risks in accordance with their national plans and policies.

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*) (A/C.2/70/L.26)

Draft resolution on implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (A/C.2/70/L.26)

3. **Mr. Marobe** (South Africa), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.26 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the effective curtailing of land degradation and desertification would have a huge impact on countries' sustainable development efforts. Addressing that challenge would also curb associated factors such as forced migration and potential fighting over resources in degraded areas.

4. The draft resolution called on the international community to provide scientific, technical and financial assistance to affected countries. Assistance in combating land degradation, desertification and drought would steer those countries towards achieving the goal on eradicating poverty.

Agenda item 23: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/70/L.27)

Draft resolution on follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (A/C.2/70/L.27)

5. **Mr. Marobe** (South Africa), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.27 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that landlocked developing countries faced special development challenges owing to their landlockedness and geographical constraints. Persistent difficulties in addressing the structural challenges stemming from their geographical disadvantages inhibited their full participation in global production networks and isolated them from global markets.

6. The draft resolution sought to build on the outcomes of previous United Nations conferences on landlocked developing countries, the most recent one being the Vienna Programme of Action for the

Landlocked Developing Countries for the Decade 2014-2024. It also urged the international community to support the implementation of the Programme of Action.

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(b) Science and technology for development (*continued*) (A/C.2/70/L.4)

Draft resolution on the International Day of Women in Science (A/C.2/70/L.4)

7. **Mr. Mansfield** (Malta), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.4, said that Armenia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Monaco, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Rwanda, Singapore, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Tunisia had joined as sponsors.

8. The draft resolution sought to create a global focus on the important role of women in scientific fields and increase their participation. While there had been a number of gender-specific awards and prizes in the sciences, greater focus on women and girls in the sciences was necessary. In particular, girls required special encouragement and role models to pursue scientific careers.

9. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which aimed to correct negative trends in global development and sustain a productive life for all, would not be achieved unless women were given ample opportunities to participate and excel in science, technology and other related fields such as education, health, economics and engineering.

10. While women constituted half of humanity, even in developed countries with ready access to higher education, there remained fewer women in the sciences than men. While national capacities differed in establishing the support needed for greater involvement of women in scientific endeavours, the concept of an International Day would serve to promote those women already in scientific fields and encourage other women and girls to follow suit. Science was essential to the development and prosperity of humanity, and scholarship devoid of the vibrancy that resulted from the inclusion of a wider pool of abilities, viewpoints and working methods would be unsatisfactory.

11. **In informal informal consultations** on the draft resolution, all paragraphs had been agreed upon except those related to horizontal language on the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the 2030 Agenda. A discussion had also taken place on the need to streamline the proclamation of international days, as they had increased substantially over the past years.

12. **The Chair** said that Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Togo and Ukraine had joined as sponsors.

Agenda item 27: Towards global partnerships (*continued*) (A/C.2/70/L.24)

Draft resolution entitled "Towards global partnerships: a principle-based approach to enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and all relevant partners (A/C.2/70/L.24)

13. **Mr. Flies** (Luxembourg), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.24 on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that member States had recognized the role of the private sector, civil society, academic and philanthropic organizations in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and in achieving sustainable development. The 2030 Agenda called on all businesses to apply creativity and innovation to solving sustainable development challenges and fostering a dynamic private sector while protecting labour rights and environmental and health standards in accordance with relevant international standards, including the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. All private sector actors must commit to respecting and supporting agreed values.

14. The draft resolution was largely a procedural update guided by the 2030 Agenda. It focused on partnerships involving United Nations agencies, funds and programmes and the United Nations Global Compact. It stressed that partnerships of the United Nations should support the implementation of United Nations values and principles, and incorporated considerations about the working methods and future agenda of the Second Committee.

15. **The Chair** said that Albania, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine had joined as sponsors.

Agenda item 18: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/70/L.2)

Draft resolution on unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries (A/C.2/70/L.2)

16. **Mr. Marobe** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, introduced the following oral revision to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.2: "Requests the Secretary-General to monitor the imposition of unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion[....]".

17. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications and that the Russian Federation had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, as orally revised.

18. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

19. *Draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.2, as orally revised, was adopted by 117 votes to 2, with 51 abstentions.*

20. **Ms. Derderian** (United States of America) said that her country believed that each Member State had the sovereign right to decide how it conducted trade with other countries, including by restricting trade in certain circumstances. Economic sanctions, whether unilateral or multilateral, were often a successful means of achieving foreign policy objectives. The United States considered its sanctions carefully and used them with specific objectives in mind, including as a means to promote a return to the rule of law or democracy, out of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, or in response to threats to international security. The United States was within its rights in using its trade and commercial policy as tools for noble objectives. In effect, the draft resolution sought to limit the international community's ability to respond by non-violent means to threats to democracy, human rights or global security. The United States had therefore requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and voted against it.

21. **Mr. Flies** (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade

Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

22. It was understood that the oral revision introduced to the draft resolution would not lead to additional costs to be borne by the United Nations system. The adoption of the resolution did not preclude the outcomes of the discussion on the revitalization of the work of the Second Committee, in particular as they related to requests for agenda items and reporting, in order to ensure the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Committee, especially in the context of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

23. It was regrettable that the resolution denouncing unilateral measures had been put to a vote in a unilateral manner, with no attempt to engage in negotiations. It was hoped that future Second Committee resolutions would be agreed upon in the spirit of consensus that had characterized the major outcomes of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

24. **Ms. Ravilova-Borovik** (Russian Federation), making a general statement after the voting, said that her delegation had firmly and consistently opposed the introduction of unilateral economic measures against developing countries. Such measures were a direct violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the standards of international law and the rules of the multilateral trading system. They undermined the very right of States to their own development, preventing them from fulfilling their obligation to ensure the well-being of their populations. Long-term use of such measures could also lead to serious humanitarian crises. The application of such measures dealt a serious blow to important sectors of the economy and had a negative impact on the rate of economic growth and on production levels. They reduced employment opportunities and income while increasing the price of basic commodities, primarily medicines and everyday items. Their long-term application could also lead to serious humanitarian crises.

25. She noted with regret that the unilateral application of such measures had not decreased, despite the fact that every year, the General Assembly condemned the practice. Attempts at political coercion through the use of sanctions, trade embargoes, and other measures were not only carried out against developing countries: the imposition of unilateral sanctions circumventing the Charter had almost become the norm. Countries employing such methods blatantly violated the principles of their own political ends, but also to remove competitors from the marketplace. The extraterritorial consequences of unilateral sanctions also impeded regional economic cooperation, a recognized mechanism for achieving global sustainable development.

26. Guided by such considerations, her delegation had sponsored the draft resolution and called on the countries imposing such measures to refrain from doing so, and from standing in the way of developing countries' efforts to improve the living conditions of their people and thereby achieve progress.

27. **Mr. Jawhara** (Syrian Arab Republic), making a general statement after the voting, said that his delegation regretted that the resolution had not been adopted by consensus, in particular since it followed both the letter and the spirit of the 2030 Agenda, which had been agreed upon unanimously. He denounced any justification of international behaviour that violated international law, the principles of the multilateral trading system and the sovereignty of States as upheld in the Charter of the United Nations.

28. His country was currently struggling under systematic terrorism, and the unilateral economic sanctions imposed on it were preventing the implementation of humanitarian and emergency plans, as well as causing major price inflation and the failure of basic services.

29. It was regrettable that certain delegations had attempted to justify the use of such measures on the pretext of combating terrorism, protecting human rights or promoting good governance. He wondered what relationship sanctions in the energy sector and financing had to furthering those goals. He would have hoped that those delegations would have voted in favour of the draft resolution in compliance with the

2030 Agenda, which condemned such international behaviour.

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/70/L.14)

Draft resolution on oil slick on Lebanese shores (A/C.2/70/L.14)

30. **The Chair** said that draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.14 had no programme budget implications.

31. **Mr. Amer** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the Second Committee was once again being side-tracked from its important work to satisfy the political, counterproductive and distorted agenda of one party to a conflict. The draft resolution presented a distorted and unbalanced narrative of what had happened in 2006. It failed to mention that the conflict had been initiated by Hizbullah, a terrorist organization that had acted with impunity in kidnapping Israeli soldiers and was now part and parcel of the Lebanese Government. The text also neglected to mention that over 4,000 rockets had been fired at towns and villages in northern Israel, causing over 800 forest fires and destroying 16,500 acres of forest and grazing land and around 1 million trees. The draft resolution likewise did not account for the extensive cooperation between Israel and the United Nations Development Programme, other United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations addressing the environmental situation along the coast of Lebanon.

32. The proponents of the draft resolution did not care about environmental issues and sustainable development, but rather about fostering a false narrative that made the victim into the aggressor and vice versa. That set a worrying precedent for other States to act aggressively against their neighbours and then seek compensation for damages when those victims acted in self-defence.

33. Although the oil slick on the Lebanese coast no longer existed, that did not seem to interfere with the political machinations of those who exploited every possibility to promote an anti-Israel agenda in the Committee and beyond. The draft resolution became increasingly out of place with every year that it was tabled. His delegation had therefore requested a vote and would vote against it.

34. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Central African Republic, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, Tuvalu.

35. *Draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.14 was adopted by 159 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions.*

36. **Mr. Abbas** (Lebanon) making a general statement after the voting, said that for the 10th consecutive year, the Second Committee had voted overwhelmingly in favour of the resolution, acknowledging the serious adverse environmental, economic and health-related implications of the oil slick in Lebanon as a consequence of the Israeli bombing of El-Jiyeh electric power plant in 2006. The resulting oil spill had entirely covered the Lebanese coastline and also affected the country's neighbours and a significant surface area of the eastern Mediterranean Sea.

37. Once again, the General Assembly had reiterated the request that the Government of Israel assume responsibility and provide prompt and adequate compensation. According to the report of the Secretary-General contained in A/70/291, compensation for damages would amount to US$856.4 million. The draft resolution reaffirmed the international community's commitment to upholding international law, in particular the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the rules and principles of international environmental law. The draft resolution carried special significance within the context of the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, which, inter alia, claimed to promote and ensure respect for international environmental law. The draft resolution asserted the will of the overwhelming majority of the international community to hold countries responsible for international wrongful acts. Lebanon would continue to mobilize all resources necessary and resort to all legal means to ensure that the resolution was fully implemented and compensation was promptly provided.

Agenda item 64: Permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (*continued*) (A/C.2/70/L.21)

Draft resolution on permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan over their natural resources (A/C.2/70/L.21)

38. **The Chair** said that the resolution contained no programme budget implications and that Turkey had joined the list of sponsors.

39. **Mr. Marobe** (South Africa) introduced a correction to the second footnote of the draft resolution.

40. **Mr. Amer** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that once again the important work of the Second Committee had been side-tracked by those who preferred to exploit the Committee for their own political agendas and remain in their comfort zone of Israel-bashing, rather than doing the difficult work of finding solutions, compromising and striving for reconciliation.

41. The draft resolution was based on a report of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia that embodied everything that a United Nations report should not be: it was one-sided, economical with the truth, factually lacking and selective in its data and analysis. Both the report and the draft resolution ignored the fact that Gaza was controlled by a terrorist organization, which divided its time and resources between attacking Israeli civilians (as had been the case in the 2014 conflict), violating the human rights of its own people, and misusing the financial resources at its disposal.

42. Unfortunately, the draft resolution did not contain any prescriptive elements calling for the conflict to be solved through direct negotiations that were based on a willingness to compromise, the promotion of reconciliation and the rejection of hatred and incitement.

43. The annual ritual of Israel-bashing and pro-Palestinian lip service was in fact a disservice to the Palestinians, and served only those who preferred continued conflict, division and unilateralism. The fact that it was the only conflict discussed in the Second

Committee illustrated that the proponents of the draft resolution were only concerned with perceived political gain, rather than finding solutions for the mutual advantage of Israelis and Palestinians alike. His delegation had therefore requested a vote and would vote against the resolution.

44. **Mr. Flies** (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting , said that as in the past, the European Union would support the draft resolution. However, the use of the term Palestine in the draft resolution could not be construed as recognition of the State of Palestine and was without prejudice to the individual position of Member States on that issue and on the validity of accession by Palestine to the conventions and treaties mentioned therein.

45. In addition, the adoption of the resolution was without prejudice to the results of the discussions on the revitalization of the work of the Second Committee, in particular with regard to the addition of subjects to the agenda and the reports ensuring the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness of the Committee's work, especially in the context of implementing the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

46. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Honduras, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Togo, Tonga.

47. *Draft resolution A/C.2/70/L.21 was adopted by 156 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions.*

48. **Mr. Abushawesh** (Observer for the State of Palestine) expressed his condolences to the Lebanese people and their families, as well as the Government, for the terrorist attacks that had claimed many lives that day.

49. The draft resolution just adopted recognized the right of the Palestinians to permanent sovereignty over their natural resources, including land and water, and therefore to reparations when those resources were exploited or endangered by illegal measures being taken by the occupying Power in Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem. Those measures included the building of settlements and the construction of the separation wall, in defiance of international law and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

50. It would be useful to remember the lessons of history: those who had provoked disasters in other

countries had been forced to pay reparations to their victims. Israel itself had received reparations on account of the actions committed by the Nazis. However, although certain losses could be covered by reparations, others could not be quantified monetarily.

51. The representative of Israel had yet again made the claim that Gaza was governed by a terrorist group. In fact, Gaza, the West Bank, occupied East Jerusalem and Israel itself were all governed by a gang of terrorists and settlers. Some days prior, the European Union had taken a step to consolidate peace in the Near East by deciding to label products produced in Israeli settlements. That was a legitimate step in the right direction that would bring Palestinians and Israelis closer to peace. The international community should now take the further step of boycotting products coming from the settlements and boycotting the settlers themselves, all of whom were terrorists, by prohibiting them from entering their countries, refusing to grant them citizenship, and refusing to grant them credentials as members of the Israeli diplomatic corps. .

Organization of work

52. **The Chair** said that regarding the draft resolutions to be adopted, there were a number of outstanding issues with cross-cutting or horizontal language which had to be resolved in order to conclude informal consultations, proceed to action and finish the work of the Committee in a timely matter. Taking into account the views of Member States and considering the fact that several processes had been delayed on account of that issue, the Bureau had decided to propose a separate process of facilitation. The process would enable delegations to present their views and eventually reach an agreement on those outstanding issues. To that end two co-facilitators had been appointed, Ms. Ordoñez Fernández (Colombia) and Mr. Cripton (Canada).

53. There were three separate horizontal issues to be addressed. First, discussions would be held on preambular paragraphs referring to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda with the aim of coming to an agreement regarding their unified form. Second, without prejudging the outcome of the discussions on the revitalization of the work of the Committee, the right balance must be found with regard to outstanding issues relating to the concluding paragraphs of resolutions referring to the future agenda items of the Committee, as well as requests for reports of the Secretary-General. Third, regarding paragraphs with a reference to Observer States, the issue should be incorporated into the scope of the facilitation process, but with the understanding that the purpose of the exercise was to provide a space for delegations to express their views and have them heard. The co-facilitators would be listening but would not be in a position to negotiate. They would report on the discussions to the Chair, who would then take action if necessary. Consultations on horizontal issues should begin immediately and conclude within the time frame established for the programme of work of the Committee.

54. He took it that that proposal was acceptable to the Committee.

55. *It was so decided.*

56. **Ms. Haynes** (Trinidad and Tobago), expressing concern for coordination and consistency in both work and language across the Committees of the General Assembly, asked whether the results of the informal consultation process on cross-cutting issues and horizontal language would also be reflected in the work of the Third Committee, which shared many thematic issues with the Second Committee.

57. **Ms. Ordoñez Fernández** (Colombia), speaking as co-facilitator of the informal consultation process, said that since proposals had been scattered across resolutions, the consultations would begin with a clean slate. The co-facilitators would ask delegations and groups to submit general comments on how they understood the paragraphs in question. Committee members would then be asked to indicate relevant information that should be covered by those paragraphs, and finally, to identify any red lines of content that should not appear.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.